

• **CU-1113H (Crown Castle) Town of Genesee, Section 24**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 4, 2009, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at S40 W28027 Hwy. 59, in Section 24 of the Town of Genesee on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioner is requesting to add a generator and associated wiring at the base of an existing communications tower for back-up power.

Mr. Mitchell noted that Condition No. 3 allows the petitioner to add additional generators, which is contrary to the Commission’s previous viewpoint on the number of generators to be allowed. In the past, they only allowed one generator and that generator needed to be appropriately sized to accommodate all the carriers on the tower. Mr. Mace replied there may be sites where there will be no need for another user on the generator and this would allow the petitioner to install a smaller generator. However, in a case where there may be several co-locators, this condition allows the petitioner to install another generator if needed. Mr. Siepmann felt the addition of more generators should not be allowed. He did not mind if the petitioner replaces the smaller generator with a larger one if needed, however he did not want to see more than one and the condition does not limit the number to be added. He asked whose idea was it to allow multiple generators. Mrs. Barrows explained at the public hearing it was discussed that what if multiple generators have less of an impact than just one large generator. The Town does not want to limit the petitioner’s options, as there are no facts to support the impact of one large generator versus several small generators. Mrs. Haukohl stated the Commission wants to be consistent, in the past they have said one generator sized for multiple users. Mrs. Barrows replied the petitioner has asked if it is appropriate to require one user to install a large generator which uses additional space and energy, etc., when it is not necessary. What if nobody else comes to use the generator for 30 years, is it really necessary to require them to have twice the size generator. Mr. Kolb replied the intent is for the petitioner to install one generator, regardless of size, and if it needs to be larger, it can be replaced, just as long as there is only one unit. Mr. Goodchild added that all generators, regardless of size are noisy and in a power outage, there will be lots of generators running. Mrs. Barrows stated that she had visited a single family home with a generator on the property line that was larger than what the petitioner is proposing and the County does not regulate or require conditional use approval for them on single family homes, they are needed for back-up power. The generator the petitioner is requesting is smaller than that generator, in the middle of a property and they are being required to apply for a Conditional Use Permit. She noted that if the petitioner is going to add or enlarge a generator, they will need to get Town and Park and Planning Commission approval. Mr. Goodchild felt that having one generator would be a better situation and if in the future the petitioner needs a larger unit, they can always reapply. Mrs. Barrows stated that any future users of the generator will have to apply for a Plan of Operation Permit, so the Town and County can keep a record of users. Chairperson Haukohl questioned the safety of the above ground diesel tank. Mr. Trost, representing Crown Castle, replied that the tank is a redundant tank, a tank within a tank. He continued that when the diesel generators are installed, they go through a separate permitting process to ensure they are certified and comply with the governing district regulations.

After discussion Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb, and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation” with Condition #3 amended to remove the words “or additional generators”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **PO-09-GNT-11 (Crown Castle) Town of Genesee, Section 24**

Mr. Mace presented the “Staff Report and Recommendation” dated June 4, 2009, and made a part of these Minutes He stated the request was related to the previous Conditional Use CU-1113H.

After discussion Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb, and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the “Staff Report and Recommendation” with Condition #3 amended to remove the words “or additional generators”. The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **CU-983A (Arnold Bomgaars) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 10**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Memorandum" dated June 4, 2009, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at N87 W36605-25 Mapleton Road, in Section 10 of the Town of Oconomowoc on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioner is requesting to transfer Conditional Use approval for a horse boarding stable and indoor riding arena from Stonehedge Farms LLC (Jon Spheeris) to the new owner, Arnold Bomgaars.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Siepmann moved, seconded by Mrs. Morris, and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioner a reasonable use of his land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

• **PO-05-OCOT-20 (Arnold Bomgaars) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 10**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Memorandum" dated June 4, 2009, and made a part of these Minutes He stated the request was related to the previous Conditional Use CU-983A.

After a brief discussion, Mr. Siepmann moved, seconded by Mrs. Morris, and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioner a reasonable use of his land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

MISCELLANEOUS

• **V-09-OCOT-06 (Matthew Cruise and Danielle Peterson) Town of Oconomowoc, Section 26**

Mr. Mace presented the "Staff Memorandum" dated June 4, 2009, and made a part of these Minutes. He pointed out the location of the property at W350 N5835 Hollyhock Court, in Section 26 of the Town of Oconomowoc on the aerial photograph and indicated the petitioners are requesting approval for construction of a retaining wall closer than 5 feet to the west property line.

Mrs. Haukohl asked who discovered that the approved Grading Plan had not been complied with? Ms. Peterson, petitioner, explained that after the original Grading Plan had been approved, the Town Building Inspector required the house to be raised two feet due to the high incidence of flooding in the subdivision. The petitioners did not know that they would have to submit the revised Grading Plan to the County for approval. Their garage has a side entry and now that it has been raised, it would be impossible to swing into it without the retaining wall. She stated her neighbor to the west has no objection to the retaining wall and delivered into record a letter from him giving his support.

After discussion, Mr. Peregrine moved, seconded by Mr. Kolb, and carried unanimously for approval, as conditioned, in accordance with the "Staff Memorandum". The approval of this request, will allow the petitioners a reasonable use of their land and meets the intent and purposes of all County Ordinances.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the Commission Mr. Hamilton moved, seconded by Mr. Mitchell and carried unanimously to adjourn at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Bonnie Morris
Secretary

BM:es